

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| In re application of: Edmund M. Clarke |) | |
| |) | |
| Application No.: 10/708,056 |) | Confirmation No.: 2055 |
| |) | |
| Group Art Unit: 2825 |) | |
| |) | |
| Examiner: Vuthe Siek |) | |
| |) | |
| Filed: February 5, 2004 |) | |
| |) | |
| Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM TO |) | |
| VERIFY A CIRCUIT DESIGN |) | |

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to Restriction Requirement Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.143

Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement dated May 15, 2006 requiring election of one of the following patentably distinct groups:

I. Claims 1-13 and 33-46 drawn to a method to verify a circuit design comprising applying a bounded model checking technique to a first and second computer language representations of the circuit design and determining a behavior consistency there between, classified in class 716, subclass 5;

**CERTIFICATE OF
ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited electronically filed with the US Patent Office on May 23, 2006 addressed to Commissioner of Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Katie M. Efland
Katie M. Efland

II. Claims 14-26, drawn to a method to verify a circuit design comprising finding a loop; and replacing the loop by unwinding assertion and duplicating a loop, classified in class 716, subclass 5; and

III. Claims 27-32, drawn to a method to verify a circuit design comprising unwinding a first and second computer language representations of the circuit design to form a first and second bit vector equations and comparing for consistency there between, classified in class 716, subclass 5.

REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated as mailed May 15, 2006, Group I (claims 1-13 and 33-46) is provisionally elected for examination.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Restriction Requirement for the following reasons. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of Groups II and III recite features that are similar to the features recited in the claims of Group I. Additionally, Groups I, II and III as indicated in the Restriction Requirement are classified in the same class and subclass. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Groups I, II and III do not recite distinct inventions and any additional time for searching any differences between the claims would be insignificant. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully solicited.

Action on the merits is awaited.

In the event that the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 23, 2006

By: 

Charles L. Moore
Registration No. 33,742
Attorney for Applicant
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Phone: 919-286-8000
Facsimile: 919-286-8199